REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-24, and 26-28 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 20, and 28 have been amended. Claim 12 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 7-24, and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Software Metrics Knowledge and Database for Project Management," by Paul et al. (" Paul") in view of "Automating Requirements Management (1999)," by Karl E. Wiegers ("Wiegers").

Paul discloses an approach which can employ modern high-level analytical techniques in conjunction with software metrics database to process the metrics data in order to gain knowledge and detailed insight into the software development process. Construction and maintenance of large, high-quality software projects is a complex, error-prone, and difficult process. Tools employing software database metrics can play an important role in efficient execution and management of such large projects. The framework disclosed in this paper incorporates database and knowledge-base tools, a formal set of software test and evaluation metrics, and a suite of advanced analytic techniques for extracting information and knowledge from available data. The framework has potential for greatly reducing venture risks and enhancing production quality in the domain of large software project management.

Wiegers discloses several benefits of a requirements management tool. Wiegers further discloses identifying the basic features to expect from such tools and reviewing four commercial tools such as, for example, TBI' Caliber-RM, QSS's DOORS, Rational's RequisitePro, and Integrated Chipware's RTM Workshop. These tools are not designed to gather the proper

11

requirements for a project and will not replace a defined process for managing project requirements. However, these tools are adapted to support and enable an established process.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for determining status of a project. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Paul and Wiegers fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of amended independent claim 1, namely, collecting data of a project, the data being structured as branches and leaves for generating leaf and branch metrics. In addition, Paul and Wiegers fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious computing at least two project progress parameters based upon the leaf and branch metrics for numerically describing elements of the project. Furthermore, Paul and Wiegers fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious computing regression parameters based upon the at least two project progress parameters wherein the two project progress parameters are based upon the leaf and branch metrics.

In contrast to claim 1, Paul discloses test and evaluation metrics for software project management. Paul fails to disclose the generation of leaf and branch metrics from project data as claimed. Paul further fails to disclose computing regression parameters based upon the at least two project progress parameters which focuses on the leaf and branch metrics as claimed. In addition, Paul discloses requiring metrics to measure software quality but fails to disclose leaf and branch metrics that help in determining the status of a project. The metrics as disclosed in Paul are not created based upon a requirements document comprising structure and content components of the requirements document as claimed.

Wiegers discloses management tools for implementing software projects. The management tools as disclosed in Wiegers fails to disclose generation of leaf and branch metrics from project data as claimed as claimed. Wiegers further teaches a hierarchical tree structure. However,

12

Wiegers fails to disclose a requirements document wherein data is structured as branches and leave and wherein the branches are representative of structure components of a requirements document, and the leaves are representative of content components of the requirements document. Wiegers further fails to disclose computing regression parameters based upon the at least two project progress parameters which focuses on the leaf and branch metrics as claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over the cited combination of Paul and Wiegers. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-5 and 7-8 depend from and further restrict independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-5 and 7-8 distinguish over Paul in view of Wiegers and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-5 and 7-8 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 9 is directed to a method for analyzing progress of a project. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Paul and Wiegers fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of amended independent claim 9, namely, parsing data of a project to produce first data records summarily describing the data of the project and generating leaf and branch metrics. In addition, Paul and Wiegers fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious computing third data records, the third data records including statistical results based upon the second data records and being indicative of the progress of the project, wherein the third data records are computed using regression analysis, the regression analysis being performed based upon the leaf and branch metrics to facilitate daily project progress assessments and forecast the need for additional resources.

In contrast to claim 9, Paul discloses test and evaluation metrics for software project management. However, Paul fails to disclose the generation of leaf and branch metrics from project data as claimed. Paul further fails to disclose computing the third data records using regression analysis based upon the leaf and branch metrics as claimed. In addition, Paul discloses requiring metrics to measure software quality but fails to disclose leaf and branch metrics that help in determining the status of a project. The metrics as disclosed in Paul are not created based upon a requirements document comprising structure and content components of the requirements document as claimed.

Wiegers discloses management tools for implementing software projects. The management tools as disclosed in Wiegers fails to disclose generation of leaf and branch metrics from project data as claimed as claimed. Wiegers further teaches a hierarchical tree structure. However, Wiegers fails to disclose a requirements document wherein data is structured as branches and leave and wherein the branches are representative of structure components of a requirements document, and the leaves are representative of content components of the requirements document. Wiegers further fails to disclose computing the third data records using regression analysis based upon the leaf and branch metrics as claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 9 distinguishes over the cited combination of Paul and Wiegers. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 10-11 and 13-19 depend from and further restrict independent claim 9 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 9, dependent claims 10-11 and 13-19 distinguish over

Paul in view of Wiegers and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 10-11 and 13-19 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 20 relates to a system for determining status of a project. Applicant respectfully submits that Paul and Wiegers fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of amended independent claim 20, namely, a first processor adapted to collect data of a project, the data being structured as branches and leaves for generating leaf and branch metrics. The processor is further adapted to compute at least two project progress parameters based upon the leaf and branch metrics and compute regression parameters based upon the at least two project progress parameters wherein the two project progress parameters are based upon the leaf and branch metrics. Additionally, Applicant submits that claim 20 patentably distinguishes over Paul and Wiegers for similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 9.

Dependent claims 21-24 and 26-27 depend from and further restrict independent claim 20 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 20, dependent claims 21-24 and 26-27 distinguish over Paul in view of Wiegers and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 21-24 and 26-27 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 28 relates to a system for determining status of a project. Applicant respectfully submits that Paul and Wiegers fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of amended independent claim 28, namely, means for collecting data of a project, the data being structured as branches and leaves for generating leaf and branch metrics. In addition, Paul and Wiegers fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious means for computing at least

two project progress parameters based upon the leaf and branch metrics and means for computing

regression parameters based upon the at least two project progress parameters wherein the two

project progress parameters are based upon the leaf and branch metrics. Additionally, Applicant

submits that claim 28 patentably distinguishes over Paul and Wiegers for similar reasons to those

discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 9, and 20.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition

for allowance.

Dated: _Sept. 2, 2005_

Respectfully submitted,

By _Stanley R. Moore_
Stanley R. Moore
   Registration No.: 26,958
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
   CORPORATION
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 855-4500
Attorneys For Applicant